



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/862,987	05/22/2001	Yaniv Gvily	017900001210	7515

20350 7590 03/25/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

JK

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/862,987

Applicant(s)

GVILY, YANIV

Examiner

Adam L Basehoar

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/20/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment 12/24/04 to the original application filed on 05/22/01.
2. Claims 25-28 have been added as necessitated by Amendment.
3. The objection to claim 17 has been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.
4. Claims 1-7, 9-16, 21, and 24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maslov (US: 6,538,673 03/25/03).
5. Claims 17-20 and 22-23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maslov (US: 6,538,673 03/25/03) in view of W3C's, "HTML 4.0 Specification: Chapter 18: Scripts," 04/24/98, <http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-html40-19980424/interact/scripts.html>, pp. 1-9).
6. Claim 8 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maslov (US: 6,538,673 03/25/03).
7. Claims 1-28 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 11, 18, and 24 are independent claim.

Information Disclosure Statement

8. The IDS filed 02/20/02 has been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claims 1-7, 9-16, 21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maslov (US: 6,538,673 03/25/03).

-In regard to independent claims 1 and 24, Maslov teaches a method for selecting hierarchical information with a computer system user interface, the method comprising steps of:

recognizing selection of an element in a hierarchy via clicking a desired element of a web page (column 5, lines 43-48);

determining a plurality of ancestor elements for the element via a DOM as a source document tree model (column 8, lines 4-20)(Fig. 2 & 4);

providing a selection control displayed on a screen (column 8, line 33: “source document displayed in a first window”) for the computer system user interface (column 8, line 41:

“selected source document fragment is highlighted”) via arrow keys of a computer keyboard (columns 5 & 8, lines 49-53 & 42-44),

wherein the selection control allows selecting any ancestor elements hierarchically-related to the element by extending, contracting, or sliding the selection area (columns 5 & 8, lines 49-53 & 42-44)(i.e. user can select any size content area containing a plurality of related elements);

Art Unit: 2178

recognizing manipulation of the selection control (i.e. selection area extends, contracts, or slides); and

selecting a unit that comprises an ancestor element and the original element in response to the recognizing step by selecting the new selection region via invoking the user interface copy command (columns 5 & 8, lines 54-57 & 45-49).

-In regard to dependent claims 2, 15-16, and 21 Maslov teaches associating a user defined trigger with content for the unit (column 13, lines 11-20: “instructed by the user to automatically compare....generating an alert”); and

notifying a user when the content changes and the trigger occurs (column 13, lines 11-20: “if they differ” and “generating an alert”), wherein the notification comprises a message (column 13, lines 15-16: “sending an e-mail message”).

-In regard to dependent claim 3, Maslov teaches wherein a user can select any set of elements of a web page (column 5, lines 42-46), wherein the user can select a specific element and by extending or contracting the selection region could select any number of descendant of any number of plurality of ancestor elements of the selected fragment (column 5, lines 46-54) (i.e. In Fig. 4 the user could select element 37 “Table”, which would be the minimal HTML element defining the selected area, which would in turn select all the descendant elements of that selection as well as give the user the ability to extend the selection area to include any number of ancestor elements of “Table”).

-In regard to dependent claim 4, Maslov teaches, as discussed above in claim 3, wherein a user can select any set of elements of a web page (column 5, lines 42-46), wherein the user can select a specific element and by extending or contracting the selection region could select any number of sibling elements of any number of plurality of ancestor elements of the selected fragment (column 5, lines 46-54) (i.e. In Fig. 4 the user could select element 35 "Td-2", which would be the minimal HTML element defining the selected area, which would in turn select all the descendant elements of that selection as well as give the user the ability to extend the selection area to include any number sibling (e.g. "Td-1") or ancestor elements of "Td-2").

-In regard to dependent claim 5, Maslov teaches wherein the providing step comprises steps of:

providing a plurality of sibling elements related to at least one of the selected elements and the plurality of ancestor elements by breaking the source document into a document tree represented by a document object model (column 8, lines 3-20)(Fig. 4) ; and

providing user-manipulatable control (columns 5 & 8, lines 45-53 & 39-44) that allows selecting a path (Fig. 5) through the plurality of sibling elements and plurality of ancestor elements (Fig. 4) wherein crossed elements and their respective descendent elements comprise the path to and thus the selected fragment (column 5, lines 63-66).

-In regard to dependent claim 6, Maslov teaches wherein the hierarchy was derived from a hypertext markup language (HTML) page (column 4, lines 48-52).

Art Unit: 2178

-In regard to dependent claim 7, Maslov teaches comprising a step of building a document object model from an HTML page (column 8, lines 3-20).

-In regard to dependent claim 9, Maslov teaches wherein the hierarchy represents a HTML file or an XML document (columns 4 & 8, lines 48-52 & 12-14).

-In regard to dependent claim 10, Maslov teaches wherein the second-listed recognizing step comprises steps of at least one of:

recognizing selection of one of the plurality of ancestor elements in the hierarchy by recognizing the extension or sideways movement of the selected area which would include ancestor elements (column 5, lines 50-53); and

recognizing selection of a sibling element in the hierarchy by the same means as taught above to select ancestor elements based on the extent with which the extension of movement of the selected area was made by the user (column 5, lines 49-53).

-In regard to independent claim 11, Maslov teaches a method for selecting HTML information with a computer system interface, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving an HTML file from a server wherein the HTML file has a hierarchy (columns 4 & 8, lines 48-52 & 3-20).;

rendering an HTML web page corresponding to the HTML file (column 5, lines 22-26 & 42-43);

recognizing selection of an element in the hierarchy (column 5, lines 42-48);

recognizing manipulation of a selection control that was displayed on a screen (column 8, line 33: “source document displayed in a first window”) for the computer system interface (column 8, line 41: “selected source document fragment is highlighted” & columns 5 & 8, lines 49-53 & 42-44); and

selecting a unit in response to the second-listed recognizing step (columns 5 & 8, lines 54-57 & 45-49) wherein the unit could comprise an ancestor element and the element (i.e. the selection control allows selecting any ancestor elements hierarchically-related to the element by extending, contracting, or sliding the selection area size to include a content area containing a plurality of related elements (columns 5 & 8, lines 49-53 & 42-44)).

-In regard to dependent claim 12, Maslov teaches further comprising a step of determining the hierarchy for the HTML file (columns 4 & 8, lines 48-52 & 3-20).

-In regard to dependent claim 13, Maslov teaches wherein the rendering step comprises a step of rendering the HTML web page (Source Document)(column 5, lines 22-27) corresponding to the HTML file without visible modification (Fig. 2: 10).

-In regard to dependent claim 14, Maslov teaches wherein a fragment (Fig. 2: 30) could comprise at least two items chosen from the selected element based on extending the selection (column 5, lines 45-53) area to include an ancestor element and a sibling element (i.e. User selects element 30 of Fig. 2 and then extends the selection area to include the entire “CYCH”

Art Unit: 2178

table which would include ancestor elements as well as sibling elements describing the stock quote.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 17-20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maslov (US: 6,538,673 03/25/03) in view of W3C's, "HTML 4.0 Specification: Chapter 18: Scripts," 04/24/98, <http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-html40-19980424/interact/scripts.html>, pp. 1-9).

-In regard to dependent claim 17, Maslov further comprises the steps of:

producing a processed web page (digest document) related to the HTML web page (column 5, lines 6-16).

Maslov does not teach deactivating all the active elements within the HTML web page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Maslov to have deactivated all the active elements within the source HTML page, because Maslov teaches that such elements (i.e. sounds, scripts, graphics, and controls) are bandwidth intensive, and by removing said elements the document would be much smaller, use less bandwidth, reduce processing power, and thus increase download times (columns 5 & 6, lines 6-16 & 27-31).

Maslov also does not specifically teach embedding a selection script into the HTML web page to provide the above mentioned selection control. W3C teaches wherein it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention to use embedded scripts in HTML pages to add interactive control (W3C: Page 2: Section 18.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the control of Maslov to have been an embedded script, because W3C taught that embedded scripts were notoriously well known in the art as a way to add increased functionality to HTML web pages (W3C: Page 2: Section 18.1).

-In regard to independent claim 18, Maslov teaches a method for selection of snippets from a web page, the method comprising the steps of:

producing a processed web page (digest document) related to the web page (column 5, lines 6-16), wherein the producing step comprises steps of:

recognizing selection of an element in a hierarchy that was related to the processed web page via clicking a desired element of a web page (column 5, lines 43-48);

determining a plurality of ancestor elements hierarchically-related to the element via a DOM as a source document tree model (column 8, lines 4-20)(Fig. 2 & 4);

recognizing manipulation of the selection control which was displayed on a screen (column 8, line 41: "selected source document fragment is highlighted") that also displays the processed web page (column 8, line 33: "source document displayed in a first window"& columns 5 & 8, lines 49-53 & 42-44), wherein the selection control allows selecting an ancestor element by extending, contracting, or sliding the selection area (columns 5 & 8, lines 49-53 & 42-44)(i.e. user can select any size content area containing a plurality of related elements); and

Art Unit: 2178

selecting a unit that comprises an ancestor element and the original element in response to the recognizing step by selecting the new selection region via invoking the user interface copy command (columns 5 & 8, lines 54-57 & 45-49).

Maslov does not teach deactivating all the active elements within the HTML web page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Maslov to have deactivated all the active elements within the source HTML page, because Maslov teaches that such elements (i.e. sounds, scripts, graphics, and controls) are bandwidth intensive, and by removing said elements the document would be much smaller, use less bandwidth, reduce processing power, and thus increase download times (columns 5 & 6, lines 6-16 & 27-31).

Maslov also does not specifically teach embedding a selection script into the HTML web page to provide the above mentioned selection control. W3C teaches wherein it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention to use embedded scripts in HTML pages to add interactive control (W3C: Page 2: Section 18.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the control of Maslov to have been an embedded script, because W3C taught that embedded scripts were notoriously well known in the art as a way to add increased functionality to HTML web pages (W3C: Page 2: Section 18.1).

-In regard to dependent claim 19, Maslov teaches determining a plurality of probable snippets for the web page;

adding functionality to the web page (i.e. allow selection of desired elements as well as keyboard manipulation to further refine selection) to allow selection of the plurality of probable snippets (column 5, lines 42-52); and

receiving input (i.e. mouse click & keyboard) selecting one of the plurality of possible snippets (column 8, lines 39-44).

-In regard to dependent claim 20, Maslov teaches receiving an address for the web page by a semi-proxy (Fig. 6: 20)(column 11, lines 4-39).

-In regard to dependent claim 22, Maslov teaches wherein the processed web page has no visual differences from the web page (column 5, lines 22-26)(Fig. 2).

-In regard to dependent claim 23, Maslov teaches wherein the determination step comprises a step of analyzing a document object model related processed web page (column 8, lines 3-20).

13. Claims 8 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maslov (US: 6,538,673 03/25/03).

-In regard to dependent claim 8, Maslov teaches wherein the providing step comprises steps of:

providing a range of ancestor elements of the element along a sliding scale as defined by the source document tree and DOM (column 8, lines 3-20)(Fig. 4); and

providing a user-manipulatable selection control with the computer system user interface via arrow keys of a computer keyboard (columns 5 & 8, lines 43-53 & 42-44) that indicates range of the selected ancestors via by extending, contracting, or sliding the selection area. Maslov does not specifically teach wherein the selection control was a slider control. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the user-manipulatable control of Maslov, to have been a slider control, because slider controls were notoriously well known in the graphical user interface art as effective range selection tools.

-In regard to dependent claim 27, Maslov teaches providing a range of descendent, ancestor, and sibling elements of the element along a sliding scale as defined by the source document tree and DOM (column 8, lines 3-20)(Fig. 4); and providing a user-manipulatable selection control with the computer system user interface via arrow keys of a computer keyboard (columns 5 & 8, lines 43-53 & 42-44) that indicates range of the selected ancestors or siblings via by extending, contracting, or sliding the selection area. Maslov does not specifically wherein the control comprises a first and second degree of freedom which navigates ancestors and descendants of the element, and for navigating among siblings of the element. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that expanding, contracting, or sliding the selection area in Maslov, which initially represents the minimal HTML element that covers the selected area (column 5, lines 46-48) in the document tree (Fig. 4), would result in the freedom to select ancestor, descendant, and sibling elements of the selected element based on the element dependency notoriously known in the art

Art Unit: 2178

and shown in Figure 4 (i.e. In reference to Figure 4, user selections could be manipulated to include document elements at any hierarchical level relative the selected HTML element).

14. Claim 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maslov (US: 6,538,673 03/25/03) in view of Vargas (US-5,748,512 05/05/98).

-In regard to dependent claim 26, Maslov teaches providing a user-manipulatable selection control with the computer system user interface via arrow keys of a computer keyboard (columns 5 & 8, lines 43-53 & 42-44) that indicates range of the selected elements by extending, contracting, or sliding the selection area. Maslov teaches wherein the selected document content area was ideal for PDA's which maintain smaller screen sizes (column 6, lines 33-42). Maslov does not teach wherein the control comprises two or four soft buttons. Vargas teaches that PDA's do not typically contain a conventional keyboard but instead rely on touch-screen keyboards (Background of Invention). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the keyboard selection control of Maslov (i.e. arrow keys represent two or more buttons on a standard keyboard) to have utilized the soft keyboard of Vargas, because Vargas taught that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention for PDA's to utilize a soft keyboard (Fig. 2) containing soft buttons (i.e. two soft arrow buttons) to provide the benefit of standard user inputted data to a smaller portable device.

Art Unit: 2178

15. Claims 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maslov (US: 6,538,673 03/25/03) in view of Seybold (US-5,877,758 03/02/99).

-In regard to dependent claims 25 and 28, Maslov teaches providing a range of HTML elements (i.e. hierarchically related ancestor, sibling, descendant HTML elements) of the selected element along a sliding scale as defined by the source document tree and DOM (column 8, lines 3-20)(Fig. 4); and providing a user-manipulatable selection control with the computer system user interface via arrow keys of a computer keyboard (columns 5 & 8, lines 43-53 & 42-44) that represents an initial minimal HTML element that covers the selected area (column 5, lines 46-48) in the document tree (Fig. 4) and indicates changing the range of the selected HTML elements via by extending, contracting, or sliding the selection area. Maslov does not specifically teach wherein the selection control was a slider control movable on a sliding scale, and where the sliding scale was demarked with characters that comprise the unit. Seybold teaches using a slider control movable along a rail (columns 2 & 5, lines 6-20 & 26-27) for controlling the parameters of a display item, wherein the slider control rail was demarked by tick marks which represent a discrete set of staggered stops (columns 2 & 8, lines 32-37 & 50-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Maslov to have utilized the slider control functionality shown in Seybold for selecting different HTML elements in the document hierarchy, because Seybold teaches that slider controls provide an easy, efficient, and intuitive manner for adjustment to multiple parameters associated with an element or item (column 2, lines 7-25) and that demarking the scale provided a visual indication of the corresponding level of the selection (column 8, lines 60-62).

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed 11/24/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regard to the rejections of claims 1-7, 9-16, 21 and 24, Applicant argues the Amended feature that the selection control was displayed on the screen. As shown above in the rejection of the claims, Maslov clearly teach wherein the selection control was displayed on the screen in the form of a user selected highlighted area. Applicant also suggests that too much weight has been given the cited reference in terms of selecting items in the hierarchy. The Examiner believes that Maslov clearly teaches within said cited references and in view of the entire reference, a user selectable control device for selecting any number of related elements in a source document via manipulating the selection control device to include said elements.

Applicant also argues that the Amended features of claims 2, 15, and 21 are not taught in Maslov. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant and believes, as shown above in the rejection of the claims, that Maslov teaches associating a trigger with the content for the unit and notifying a user when the content changes and the trigger occurs, wherein the notification comprises a message (column 13, lines 10-20).

Applicant further argues that the obvious type rejection of claims 17-20 and 22-23 was not proper. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the

Art Unit: 2178

knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the W3C reference teaches that it was well known in the art for selection scripts to be imbedded in HTML documents to render them interactive by increasing the functionality of HTML web pages. Specifically the W3C reference teaches wherein scripts were well known to create graphical user interface elements for user manipulation.

Applicant finally argues that the obvious type rejection of claims 8, 25, and 27 was improper. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). As stated above, the Examiner believes it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Maslov to have utilized a slider control, because the user-manipulatable control of Maslov maintained functionality (i.e. "expanding", "contracting", "move sideways") that were notoriously well known in the art to be provided by slider controllers and that slider controls were notoriously well known graphical user interface controls to provide intuitive effective range selection tools (Note the Seybold reference as applied to the rejections of claims 25 and 28).

Conclusion

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US-6,750,889

06-2004

Livingston, Kris

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER